

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,934	07/29/2003	Verivada Chandrasekaran	10527-410002	9045
26161	7590 10/13/2006	•	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022			GHERBI, SUZETTE JAIME J	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3738	
			DATE MAILED: 10/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		NJ				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Antique Summers	10/629,934	CHANDRASEKARAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Suzette J. Gherbi	3738				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 Ju	<u>ıne 2006</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1.4-12 and 43-52 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1.4-12 and 43-52 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers	·					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the c Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is a	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicatity documents have been received in Received in Received in Received in Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Date				

Application/Control Number: 10/629,934 Page 2

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

1 Applicant's RCE and amendment and remarks dated 6/9/06 have been received in application serial number 10/629,934.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-12, 43-51 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1, 4-10, 12, 43-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Callol et al. 6,174,329. Callol et al discloses the invention as claimed noting figures 1-7 comprising: a first portion (10) and a second portion disposed outwardly of the first portion and having a first layer including a radiopaque material (this could be any of he metals listed in col. 5, lines 55-57 ie. tantalum) that is more radiopaque then the first portion; a second layer comprising an alloy (alloy simply means more two or more mixed metals) comprising the radiopaque material and a second material and a third layer comprising an oxidized form of the alloy. These

Application/Control Number: 10/629,934

Page 3

Art Unit: 3738

limitations are met (see col. 5, line 56, col. 6, lines 35-37) because col. 6, lines 47-54 state that the stent 10 (which is the first portion) is covered by a radiopaque coating (40) which may be loaded with radiopaque agents such as barium, titanium oxide and further multiple layers of the protective layer can be applied to the sent. The claims as written with the term "comprising" do not "limit" the materials and thus may include other materials. It is inherent (for example see application 2002/0138136 section [0029]"stable native oxides are formed) that materials that are mixed form alloys and if titanium and tantalum are alloys then an oxide is formed (see col. 6, line50) that it would provide an oxidized form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callol et al. in view of Roth 2004/0054399. Callol et al. has been disclosed above however Callol et al. does not specify a drug-releasing layer. Roth teaches a stent covered/layered with radiopaque material with a drug releasing layer (see [0032]). It

Application/Control Number: 10/629,934

Art Unit: 3738

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the invention of Callol et al. and incorporate therapeutic agents in the

layers as taught by Roth in order to treat the vessel intima upon implantation and

Page 4

expansion of the device.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 6/9/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner have give another rejection under Callol. Applicant contends that Callol et al. does not suggest a layer comprising an alloy of titanium and tantalum. It is the examiners opinion that the office action is correct. Callol teaches the limitations as claimed specifically (noting claims 1 and 12) Collol has a second portion having a first layer which is a radiopaque layer of a metal; a second layer called the protective layer/coating (40); wherein the protective layer/coating comprises an alloy (which is a titanium alloy even though claims 1 and 12 are not limited by titanium nor tantalum) and a second material (see col. 6, lines 24-54) wherein the second material can be a polymer loaded with the alloy. Callol further states that multiple layers loaded with radiopaque agents may be utilized. The applicants use of the word "comprising" does not mean that additional materials can't be present. Therefore, applicant's arguments are not convincing and the office action deemed proper.

Art Unit: 3738

Conclusion

- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suzette J. Jackson whose work schedule is Monday-Friday 9-6:30 off every other Friday and whose telephone number is 571-272-4751.
- 8. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306.
- 9. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.

SUZETTE GHERBI PRIMARY EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

04 October 2006